

REMARKS

Upon entry of the amendment made herein, claims 1-22 remain pending in the present application.

Applicants appreciate the courtesy extended to the Applicants' counsel by the Examiner in the telephone interview on July 28, 2003. In the telephone interview, Applicants' counsel discussed the case with the Examiner. The amendments to independent claims 1, 7, 12 and 18 are in accordance with the discussion in the telephone conference, and further clarifies those claims. Additionally, the Applicants herewith submit remarks specifically responding to the rejections raised by the Examiner in the Office Action, and his concerns raised in the July 28, 2003 interview. It is believed that no new matter has been added to the present application.

1. Summary Of Rejections

The Office Action rejects claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,442,576 issued to Edelman (the “576 patent”), and claims 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the 576 patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,505,191 issued to Baclawski (the “191 patent”).

2. Interview Summary

In the July 28, 2003 interview, Applicants' counsel endeavored to generally explain to the Examiner the novel concepts of the invention as claimed. Applicants' counsel explained to the Examiner that prior art search query systems provide search results comprising text representations of qualifying records. None of the prior art references cited by the Office Action teach or suggest presenting objects related to the

text representations of the qualifying records, each object having at least one predetermined attribute.

The Examiner stated that he was concerned that the term “object” in the claims as written could be construed to comprise a text object, and requested that the Applicants address this concern in this written Response. Applicants believe that the remarks and amendments to the claims address the Examiner’s concern, as well as the specific rejections in the Office Action, and present the following remarks in this regard.

3. Specific Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office action rejects claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,442,576 issued to Edelman (the “’576 Patent”). Claims 2-6 depend from independent claim 1; claims 8-11 depend from independent claim 7; and claims 13-17 depend from independent claim 12. Applicants respectfully traverse the §102(e) rejections of claims 1-17.

For brevity, and because the Applicants’ arguments against the rejection of claims 1-17 as being anticipated by the ‘576 Patent are equally applicable for all of these claims, Applicants use claim 1 as illustrative of the response for all of currently pending claims 1-17. Furthermore, the traversal is made with the understanding that the remaining independent claims and all of the dependent claims are also patentably distinct over the prior art and may include additional features that, beyond those recited in claim 1, provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

The Office action alleges that the ‘576 patent discloses all of the elements of claims 1, 7 and 12, including transmitting a representation of an object in relation with the text representation of each qualifying record that includes an object comprising at

least one predetermined attribute for display to the user. As discussed in the July 28, 2003 telephone interview, Applicants do not believe that this feature is disclosed by the '576 patent. The Examiner stated that he was concerned that the term "object" could be construed to mean a "text object."

Applicants respectfully submit that the term "object," in the context of the claims pending before the amendments herein, should not be construed to include text objects (since the implication is already that the objects sent or presented with text results are something other than text). However, in accord with what was discussed in the telephone interview, Applicants have amended all of the independent claims to recite "a non-text object." Given the inherent meaning of the term "object" in the pre-amendment claims, Applicants believe that this amendment does not change the scope of the independent claims, but merely clarifies those claims.

Applicants do not believe that the '576 patent, nor any of the art cited by the Examiner, discloses transmitting a representation of a *non-text* object in relation with the text representation of each qualifying record that includes an object comprising at least one predetermined attribute for display to the user.

In light of the above, Applicants believe that the §102 rejection of independent claims 1, 7 and 12 has been traversed, and amended claims 1, 7 and 12 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2-6 depend from independent claim 1, claims 8-11 depend from independent claim 7, and claims 13-17 depend from independent claim 12 respectively, and therefore those claims are in condition for allowance as well.

4. Specific Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office action rejects claims 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by the '576 Patent, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,505,191 issued to Baclawski (the "'191 patent"). Claims 19-22 depend from independent claim 18. Applicants respectfully traverse the §103(a) rejections of claims 18-22.

For brevity, and because Applicants' arguments against the rejection of claims 18-22 as being anticipated by the '576 patent in view of the '191 patent are equally applicable for all of these claims, Applicants use claim 18 as illustrative of the response for all of currently pending claims 18-22. Furthermore, the traversal is made with the understanding that the remaining dependent claims are also patentably distinct over the prior art and may include additional features that, beyond those recited in claim 18, provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

The Office action alleges that the '576 patent and the '191 patent, in combination, disclose all of the elements of claim 18. As discussed with the Examiner in the July 28, 2003 telephone interview, neither the '576 patent nor the '191 patent disclose a system for indexing records in an index of an information network wherein an indexing module searches a record received by a web browser for a link to an object comprising at least one specified attribute and wherein a representation of the object is stored in association with the corresponding indexed record. However, in accord with the Examiner's concern that the term "object" could be construed to mean a "text object," Applicants have amended independent claim 18 to recite "a non-text object."

As discussed with respect to claims 1-17 above, Applicants respectfully submit that the term "object," in the context of claim 18 pending before the amendment of that

claim herein, already should be construed to comprise a non-text object. Thus, Applicants believe that this amendment does not change the scope of independent claim 18, but merely clarifies that claim.

Applicants do not believe that the '576 patent or the '191 patent discloses a system for indexing records in an index of an information network wherein an indexing module searches a record received by a web browser for a link to a non-text object comprising at least one specified attribute and wherein a representation of the object is stored in association with the corresponding indexed record.

In light of the above, Applicants believe that the §103 rejection of independent claim 18 has been traversed, and amended claim 18 is in a condition for allowance. Dependent claims 19-22 depend from independent claim 18, and therefore those claims are in condition for allowance as well.


CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest and bona fide effort to clarify the issues before the Examiner and to place this case in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing discussions, it is clear that the cited art, in combination, does not teach all of the elements of any claim of the present invention. Thus, the claimed invention is patentably distinct over the prior art. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of all of claims 1-22 is believed to be in order, and an early Notice of Allowance to this effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (310) 712-8311. The undersigned attorney can normally be reached Monday through Friday from about 9:30 AM to 5:30 PM Pacific Time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 11, 2003



IVAN POSEY
Reg. No. 43,865
BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN FELDER
& STEINER LLP
1880 Century Park East, Suite 711
Los Angeles, California 90067
(310) 712-8300

IMP